

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,516	02/24/2004	John Gillespie	461494-0121	8325
<sup>27433</sup> FOLEY & LAF	7590 06/05/2007 RDNER LLP .	•	EXAMINER	
321 NORTH CLARK STREET			WOOD, KIMBERLY T	
SUITE 2800 CHICAGO, IL	60610-4764		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3632		
	`			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/785,516	GILLESPIE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kimberly T. Wood	3632
The MAILING DATE of this commu Period for Reply	nication appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE I Extensions of time may be available under the provisior after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a munication. statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ly will, by statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
	led on <u>5/22/07</u> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. n for allowance except for formal matt tice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.E	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 3-7 and 9-20 is/are pendir 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 3-7 and 9-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restr	are withdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
	e: a) accepted or b) objected to ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyang the correction is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies</li></ul>	y documents have been received. y documents have been received in A s of the priority documents have been onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	—	(DTO 442)
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (3)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	(PTO-948) Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

This is an office action for serial number 10/785,516, in response to amendment RCE filed on May 22, 2007

## Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claims 5, 9, 15, and 16 is withdrawn in view of reference to Lindenmuth 3,358,957.

Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-7 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is an inconsistency between the language in the preamble and certain portions in the body of the claim, thereby making the scope of the claim unclear. The preamble in claim clearly indicates that a subcombination is being claimed, e.g., "a system for mounting a device from the underside of a body having a planar surface ...." This language would lead the

examiner to believe that the applicant intends to claim only the subcombination of "a," the being only functionally recited.

This presents no problem as long as the body of the claim also refers to the functionally, such as, "for attachment to said underside of a body having a planar surface..."

Page 3

The problem arises when the planar surface is positively recited within the body of the claim, such as, "mounting bracket coupled to the planar surface." There is an inconsistency within the claim; the preamble indicates subcombination, while in at least one instance in the body of the claim there is a positive recital of structure indicating that the combination of a and a are being claimed. The examiner cannot be sure if applicant's intent is to claim merely the system or the system in combination with the body.

Applicant is required to clarify what the claims are intended to be drawn to, i.e., either the system alone or the combination of the system and the body. Applicant should make the language of the claim consistent with applicant's intent. In formulating a rejection on the merits, the examiner is considering that the claims are drawn to the subcombination and the claims will be rejected accordingly. If applicant indicates by amendment that the combination claim is the intention, the language in the preamble should be made consistent with the language in the body of the claims. If the intent is to claim

the subcombination, then the body of the claims must be amended to remove positive recitation of the combination.

Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15 recite the limitation "the underside" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the mounting surface" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the underside" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for the above reasons. Please note that the Examiner may not have pointed out each and every example of indefiniteness or enablement. The applicant is required to review all the claim language to make sure the claimed invention is clear and definite.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 5

Claims 3-5, 9, 14-16, 18, and 19, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lindenmuth 3,358,957.

Lindenmuth discloses a system comprising a mounting bracket (44 or 210 or 46c), a tilt block (36 or 36c, see column 2, lines

44ff) rotatably coupled to the mounting bracket, a mounting arm (86), an adapter (144) having an adapter arm (120), a cover piece (88), means for sliding the adapter (the telescoping properties) being at least one elongate track (the slot within the mounting arm allowing telescoping movement of the adapter arm), mounting bracket plate (64 or 64c), mounting bracket including a lateral surface (surface of 410) and a region (see figure 12, between 410 and including open space where 34c is received).

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 12, and 13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 7, 10, 11, 17, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd

paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art discloses conventional systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly T. Wood whose telephone number is 571-272-6826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Friedman Carl can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/785,516 Page 7

Art Unit: 3632

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3632

May 28, 2007